

Strongly Temperature Dependent Sliding Friction for a Superconducting Interface

J. B. Sokoloff, M. S. Tomassone and A. Widom

Physics Department and Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Complex Systems, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115.

(February 1, 2008)

A sudden drop in mechanical friction, between an adsorbed nitrogen monolayer and a lead substrate, occurs when the lead passes through the superconducting transition temperature. We attribute this effect to a sudden drop at the superconducting transition temperature of the substrate Ohmic heating. The Ohmic heating is due to the electronic screening current that results from the sliding adsorbed film.

A longstanding question in the field of nanotribology (wearless friction between well characterized surfaces) is whether frictional dissipation is dominated by the creation of phonons or the creation electronic excitations. To study this question, an experiment using a quartz crystal microbalance (QCM) was performed in which a monolayer film of nitrogen was deposited on flat lead substrate microbalance electrodes [1]. When the temperature of the lead was lowered below the superconducting transition temperature T_c , a rapid (nearly discontinuous) drop was observed in the monolayer friction. The friction was deduced from the damping of the quartz microbalance oscillator. The drop in friction was interpreted as a reduction in the substrate electronic heating.

The electronic contribution to sliding friction experienced by a non-metallic film sliding on a metallic surface, is usually attributed to the creation of excitations of the metallic substrate electrons [2]. However, as the temperature is lowered below the substrate superconducting transition temperature, the normal (non-superconducting) fraction of electrons decreases gradually. The friction contribution due to the creation of electronic excitations might naively be thought to also decrease relatively gradually. On the basis of the above argument, the almost discontinuous experimental results in Ref. [1] would appear to be surprising. The solution to this puzzle lies in the nature of the electronic excitations in the superconducting substrate.

In addition to the finite frequency electron-hole pair creation mechanism of Ref. [2] for electronic friction, there exists the (virtually) zero frequency electron-hole pairs normally considered responsible for Ohmic heating in metals. Substrate Ohmic heating, induced by a sliding film, will be enhanced if the atoms in the film are charged. A net charge may appear on an atom if electrons are donated to the metallic substrate. Such a charge redistribution results in a monolayer surface dipole moment. The surface dipole charge structure induces Ohmic heating resulting from the electric currents in the metallic substrate induced by the sliding monolayer film. The electronic charge redistribution follows the film atoms as they move over the substrate surface [3]. Unlike the mechanism of Ref. [2], this mechanism vanishes very quickly as electron pairs form in the superconductor, i.e. practically

right at T_c . We propose this mechanism as the reason for the rapid drop in the friction observed in the experiment of Dayo and Krim.

It is well established that the adsorption of a non-metallic film results in an observed change [4] in the work function (i.e. electron chemical potential) of a metallic substrate. This observation has been interpreted in terms of transfer of electronic charge from the film to the metallic substrate, or equivalently as a surface dipole moment per unit area of the film atoms. This picture produces the electric fields needed for the mechanism in Ref. [3].

In Ref. [3], the force of friction acting on a charged atom whose center moves parallel to the substrate a distance Z above its surface is defined as the interaction of the atom with the electric field due to its image charge. The image electric field is

$$\mathbf{E}_{image} = -q\eta \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \left\{ \frac{(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i|^3} \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where the operator $\eta(i\partial/\partial t)$ is constructed by the substitution ω to $i(\partial/\partial t)$ in the formula $\eta(\omega) = (\epsilon(\omega) - 1)/(\epsilon(\omega) + 1)$. The dielectric constant $\epsilon(\omega)$ is related to electrical conductivity $\sigma(\omega)$ via $\epsilon(\omega) = 1 + (4\pi i\sigma(\omega)/\omega)$. $\mathbf{R}_i$ is the location of the center of the electrical image of the charged atom. If $\mathbf{R}=(X,Y,Z)$ is the location of the center of the charged atom, then $\mathbf{R}_i = (X,Y,-Z)$. The conductivity of the substrate can be represented by a Drude model. For the superconducting state,

$$\sigma(\omega) = \left(\frac{n_n e^2 \tau_s}{m} \right) - \left(\frac{n_s e^2}{im\omega} \right), \quad (2)$$

where n_n and n_s are the number densities of normal and superconducting electrons, respectively, and τ_s is the scattering time for the normal electrons. Since the time Fourier transforms of smooth functions of $\mathbf{R}_i(t)$ are expected to be peaked around a frequency of the order of the sliding velocity of the atom divided by an atomic length scale (i.e., about $10^{-8}cm$) [1], and since the only other frequency in the problem (in Gaussian units) is determined by $\sigma_n = (n_n e^2 \tau_s / m)$ (which for $n_s \approx 10^{23}cm^{-3}$ and $\tau_s \approx 10^{-14}s^{-1}$ is of the order of $10^{17}s^{-1}$), we are justified in expanding the operator $\eta(i\partial/\partial t)$ in powers of $i(\partial/\partial t)$. This is equivalent to expanding $\eta(\omega)$ in powers

of ω , which gives us a series expansion of the friction in powers of the sliding velocity. For the superconductor, up to third order

$$\eta \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \approx -i \left(\frac{m}{2\pi n_s e^2} \right) \left[\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{n_n \tau_s}{2\pi e^2 n_s^2} \right) \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^3 + \dots \right]. \quad (3)$$

Let us operate with Eq.(3) on the curly bracketed factor in Eq. (1), and then set $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{R}$. The second derivative term gives no contribution to the component of the force parallel to the surface of the substrate. The third derivative term gives

$$F = \left(\frac{n_n \tau_s V}{n_s h} \right)^2 \left\{ \left(\frac{q^2 m}{2\pi n_n e^2 \tau_s} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{V}}{h^3} \right) \right\}. \quad (4)$$

The terms in curly brackets are the expression for the force of friction for the normal state found in Ref. [3]. Hence, $\tau_s V/h \approx (10^{-13} \text{sec}/10^{-8} \text{cm})(1 \text{cm/sec}) = 10^{-6}$ implies that $\mathbf{F}$ in the superconducting state will be much smaller than the normal state force of friction as long as $n_n/n_s < 10^6$. This condition holds true even for T very slightly below T_c . The density of superconducting electrons n_s can be deduced from measurements of the London penetration depth $\Lambda = \sqrt{(mc^2)/(4\pi n_s e^2)}$.

In Ref. [2], the “slip time” τ of a film was measured, where τ is defined as the time required for the velocity of a sliding film to decay to $1/e$ of its initial value. τ^{-1} was found to decrease by $6.6 \times 10^7 \text{sec}^{-1}$ on dropping below T_c . We assume that the lead resistivity sample used in Ref. [1] and the lead substrate used in the microbalance both have a thickness of $1500 \text{\AA}$, and that the samples slabs were $3 \text{mm} \times 3 \text{mm}$ squares [5]. The resistance for the lead sample given in the experiment was 0.04 Ohms just above T_c . Thus the normal state resistivity was $6 \times 10^{-7} \text{ Ohm-cm}$. Equivalently, the conductivity was $1.5 \times 10^{18} \text{sec}^{-1}$ in Gaussian units. On the basis of Ref. [2], the change in τ^{-1} at T_c is given by

$$\Delta(\tau)^{-1} = \left(\frac{Z^2 e^2}{16\pi m \sigma h^3} \right) \approx$$

$$\frac{1^2 (4.8 \times 10^{-10} \text{esu})^2}{16\pi (4.6 \times 10^{-23} \text{gm})(1.5 \times 10^{18} \text{sec}^{-1})(10^{-8} \text{cm})^3}, \quad (5)$$

for nitrogen sliding on lead. In Eq.(5), $4.6 \times 10^{-23} \text{gm}$ is the mass of a nitrogen molecule, and $h \approx 10^{-8} \text{cm}$ is half of a lattice constant for solid nitrogen, which we take as its distance above the substrate. Then we obtain $\Delta(\tau)^{-1} = 6.6 \times 10^7 \text{sec}^{-1}$, which is consistent with the results of Ref. [1]

Since the picture presented here is based on a model in which the film atoms are charged, it is necessary to make

some rough estimates of the corrugation potential i.e., the dependence of the potential of interaction between a film atom on the surface and the ions inside the metal substrate on the position of the film atom on the surface. We wish to determine whether the small values of the corrugation needed to explain experiments done with the QCM [6] can occur when the film atoms are charged. If the adsorbate atoms are charged, it is expected that the main contribution to the corrugation potential results from the screened Coulomb interaction between the adsorbate atom and the ions. As a rough approximation to this interaction, let us use the Thomas-Fermi approximation [7] to the interaction between an adsorbate atom and an ion in the metal, $(q_1 q_2 e^{-k_s r}/r)$, where q_1 and q_2 are the charges of the two atoms, and r is the distance between them. In these estimates, it is assumed that the adsorbate atom lies right on the surface and is “bathed” in conduction electrons. The inverse screening length $k_s \approx [4\pi e^2 g(\epsilon_F)]^{1/2}$, where $g(\epsilon_F)$ is the density of states at the Fermi level. Using the free electron density of states appropriate for lead [8], and choosing the effective mass of an electron in lead to be $m = 1.3m_e$, we obtain $k_s \approx 2.2/\text{\AA}$. For these estimates, the metal ions near the surface were taken to lie on a triangular lattice in which each ion has a charge $4e$ (for lead). We used a lattice constant $2.9 \text{\AA}$. The interaction between an adsorbate atom located $\approx 4 \text{\AA}$ above the center of the plane along which the centers of the ions of a 900 atom lattice lie is then numerically summed over the positions of the ions in the lattice. This interaction was found for three positions of the adsorbate atom: (1) above the triangle formed by three near neighbor ions in the lattice, (2) above one of the ions, and (3) above the line joining two nearest neighbor ions. The potential of interaction was found to be respectively 17.6meV , 22.3meV and 17.9meV . Thus, we conclude that the corrugation potential is of the order of a few meV’s. This value is comparable to that used to successfully simulate QCM measurements of friction for rare gas atoms adsorbed on a noble metal substrate. [6]

We conclude that the sudden drop in the sliding friction acting on a nitrogen film as it slides over a lead substrate, as the lead drops below its superconducting transition temperature, can be attributed to Ohmic heating induced in the metal by the sliding nitrogen film.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

J. B. S wishes to thank the Department of Energy (Grant DE-FG02-96ER45585).

- [1] A. Dayo, W. Alnasrallah and J. Krim, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1690 (1998).
- [2] B.N.J. Persson, Phys. Rev. B 44, 3277 (1991); B.N.J. Persson and A. Volokitin, J. Chem. Phys. 103, 8679 (1995); J. B. Sokoloff, Phys. Rev. B 52, 5318 (1995); L. S. Levitov, Europhysics Letters 8, 499 (1989).
- [3] M. S. Tomassone and A. Widom, Phys. Rev. B 56, 4938 (1997); Am. J. Phys. 65, 1181 (1997); T. H. Boyer, Phys. Rev. A 9, 68 (1974).
- [4] C. Wang and R. Gomer, Surf. Sci. 91, 533 (1980); Surf. Sci. 84, 329 (1979); Surf. Sci. 74, 389 (1979); P. W. Palmberg, Surf. Sci. 25, 598 (1971); T. Engel and R. Gomer, J. Chem. Phys. 52, 5572 (1979); J. C. P. Mignolet, J. Chem. Phys. 21, 1298 (1953); Discussions Faraday Soc. 8, 105 (1950).
- [5] J. Krim, private communication.
- [6] M. S. Tomassone, J. B. Sokoloff, A. Widom, J. Krim Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 24 4798 (1997); M. Cieplak, E. D. Smith and M. O. Robbins, Science 265, 1209 (1994); Phys. Rev. B 54, 8252 (1996).
- [7] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, Solid State Physics (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Philadelphia, PA, 1976), pp. 340-342.
- [8] *ibid.*, p. 38.